

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Attached is a Submission of Replacement Drawing Sheets including a change to each of Figs. 1, 4 and 5. These Replacement Drawing Sheets, which include all of Figs. 1-13 in this application, replace the previously-filed drawing sheets. In these Replacement Drawing Sheets, Fig. 1, 4 and 5 have been amended to replace all occurrences of "VOICE" with --SPEECH--, in response to the Examiner's comments at page 2, section 2 of the Office Action.

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

A new title of the invention is required.

The specification, title, and claims stand objected to because of alleged informalities.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brotman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,967) (hereinafter “Brotman”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended the title in accordance with the Office Action’s requirement for a new title. Applicants have also amended claims to improve their form. Accordingly, claims 1-8 remain pending for consideration.

Objection to the Title

The Office Action alleges that the title of the invention is “not descriptive”. Accordingly, a new title is required. In accordance with this requirement, Applicants have changed the title to “APPARATUS AND METHOD OF SPEECH RECOGNITION WHICH ACQUIRES SIMILARITIES BETWEEN INPUT SPEECH AND STORED OBJECT WORDS”. Withdrawal of the requirement for a new title is thus respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The specification is objected to because of particular alleged informalities as set forth by the Examiner at page 2, section 2 of the Office Action. In particular, the Examiner alleges that the use of the term “voice recognition” in the specification, title and claims of this application is improper. The Examiner points out that the “correct terminology needed for the claimed invention is ‘speech recognition.’” Accordingly, the Examiner requires appropriate correction.

In response to the Examiner’s requirement, Applicant has amended the specification, as well as the title, claims and abstract to replace all occurrences of “voice recognition” with “speech recognition” in accordance with the Examiner’s helpful suggestion. In addition, in an effort to render consistency throughout the disclosure of this application, Applicant has opted to more generally change every occurrence of “voice” with --speech-- in response to the Examiner’s requirement. This change has also been incorporated into the drawings, as discussed previously.

Because the Examiner’s requirement in this regard necessitated numerous amendments to the specification, Applicant hereby submits a substitute specification. Also included with the substitute specification is a substitute abstract that commences on a separate sheet, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.52(b)(1). For the convenience of the Examiner, a marked-up version showing the changes between the originally filed specification and Abstract and the substitute specification and new Abstract is submitted herewith.

Applicant has submitted this substitute specification including changes to the originally filed disclosure to address the Examiner’s concerns. Applicant respectfully requests that the substitute specification be entered into this application in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.125(b).

Applicant respectfully submits that these changes to the instant application are being implemented in response to the Examiner's requirement at page 2 of the Office Action and they are consistent with the Examiner's suggested changes. Accordingly, the amendments do not constitute new matter. Withdrawal of the objection to the specification is thus respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph and Claim Objections

Claims 1-8 stand objected to and also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended claims 1-8 in accordance with the Examiner's comments in the Office Action at pages 2-3. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-8, as amended, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Brotman. Applicant has amended claims 1-8 to improve the form of the claims. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

At page 4, lines 4-7 of the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that Brotman, at col. 5, lines 64-67 discloses a "computing means for acquiring similarities between the voice inputted

from said voice input means and the object words stored in said storage means." Applicant respectfully traverses such an interpretation of Brotman for at least the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that Brotman requires a user to initially enter a zip code for searching an objective address. See col. 5, lines 30-33 of Brotman. The zip code is a search key in the disclosed system of Brotman.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action has misapplied Brotman against the claims of the instant application because the disclosure of Brotman is based on a zip code which the user initially enters to search the objective address.

As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that Brotman does not teach, or even suggest, at least the computing means for acquiring similarities between the speech inputted from said speech input means and the object words stored in said storage means, as described in independent claim 1. Similar arguments apply to the remaining independent claims 2, 7 and 8.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Brotman does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 2, 7 and 8. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 3-6 are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1 or 2, and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP



Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Dated: February 6, 2006

By:

Customer No. 55694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465